The Hostility Toward Theological Scholarship in Chinese Protestantism: A Comparative Study with Western Protestant Traditions

華人基督教新教對神學學術的敵視：與西方新教傳統之比較研究

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευίτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

Introduction 導論

One of the most pressing yet underexamined crises within Chinese Protestantism is the deeply entrenched hostility toward theologians, biblical scholars, and anyone who approaches Scripture through the lens of the original biblical languages—Greek and Hebrew. Unlike their Western Protestant counterparts, who have historically built their entire homiletical, exegetical, and theological traditions upon mastery of the original languages, Chinese Protestant communities have often elevated a single vernacular translation—the Chinese Union Version (CUV, 和合本)—to a status approaching that of the inspired autographs themselves. The consequence is a theological culture in which any voice that refers to the original languages is viewed with suspicion, and scholars possessing genuine knowledge of biblical Greek, Hebrew, and Apostolic teaching are treated not as resources for the edification of the Church but as threats to be silenced.

華人基督教新教界中最迫切卻鮮少被深入研究的危機之一，便是對神學家、聖經學者，以及任何透過原文語言——希臘文與希伯來文——來解讀聖經之人的根深蒂固的敵意。與西方新教同道不同，西方教會歷史上以掌握原文語言為其講道、釋經及神學傳統的根基，華人新教圈卻往往將單一的本地語譯本——和合本聖經——抬舉至幾乎等同於受默示之原稿的地位。其後果是形成了一種神學文化：凡引用原文語言者皆遭猜忌，而真正具備聖經希臘文、希伯來文及使徒教導知識的學者，不被視為造就教會的資源，反而被當作需要壓制的威脅。

This essay examines the roots, characteristics, and consequences of this phenomenon, drawing upon recent scholarship—most notably Yonghua Ge's (葛牧之) groundbreaking 2025 monograph *Zhongguo Jiaohui de Fanzhi Zhuyi* (《中國教會的反智主義》, *Anti-Intellectualism in the Chinese Church*), and the parallel work of Mark Noll on Western evangelicalism—to offer a comparative analysis between Chinese and Western Protestant approaches to theological learning and the original biblical languages.

本文旨在探討此現象之根源、特徵及後果，援引近年學術研究——尤其是葛牧之2025年出版的開創性專著《中國教會的反智主義》，以及馬克·諾爾（Mark Noll）對西方福音派的平行研究——進行華人與西方新教在神學學習和聖經原文語言取向上的比較分析。

I. The Western Protestant Tradition: Zeal for the Original Languages

一、西方新教傳統：對原文語言的熱切追求

The Protestant Reformation was, at its core, a movement built upon the recovery of the biblical languages. The Reformers' rallying cry of *sola Scriptura* was not a slogan for relying on any given translation; it was an insistence that the Church must return to the *fons et origo*—the original Hebrew and Greek texts from which all translations derive their authority. As Philip Schaff observed, "In the Middle Ages the knowledge of Greek

and Hebrew almost disappeared from the Latin Church; the study of the Bible was sadly neglected, and all sorts of unscriptural traditions were accumulated… The Reformers were good Greek and Hebrew scholars, and rank among the best translators and commentators of all ages" (Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, 1894, 102).

新教宗教改革在其核心上，乃是建基於聖經原文語言之恢復的運動。改教者們高舉「唯獨聖經」（*sola Scriptura*）的旗幟，絕非依賴某一特定譯本，而是堅持教會必須回到一切譯本之權威所出的源頭——原文希伯來文與希臘文。如菲利普・沙夫所觀察：「在中世紀，希臘文與希伯來文的知識在拉丁教會中幾乎消失殆盡；聖經研究被嚴重忽略……改教者們是優秀的希臘文與希伯來文學者，在歷代最好的翻譯家與註釋家之列」（Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, 1894, 102）。

Martin Luther was unequivocal about the indispensability of the original languages. In his treatise "To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools" (1524), Luther famously declared: "The languages are the sheath in which this sword of the Spirit is contained; they are the casket in which we carry this jewel; they are the vessel in which we hold this wine… If through our neglect we let the languages go (which God forbid!), we shall… lose the Gospel" (Luther, *Works*, vol. 4, 114). Luther further insisted that "a simple preacher, to be sure, is in possession of so many clear passages… that he can know and teach Christ… But to interpret Scripture, to treat it independently, and to dispute with those who cite it incorrectly, to that he is unequal; that cannot be done without the languages" (Luther, *Works*, vol. 4, 117).

馬丁・路德對原文語言之不可或缺性，態度毫不含糊。在其1524年致德國各城市議員的論文中，路德著名地宣告：「語言是裝載聖靈之劍的鞘；是我們運載這珍寶的匣子；是我們盛裝這美酒的器皿……若因我們的疏忽而任由語言流失（願上帝禁止！），我們將……失去福音」（Luther, *Works*, vol. 4, 114）。路德更堅持道：「一個簡單的傳道人……確實能認識基督

並傳講祂……但要獨立解釋聖經、與那些錯誤引用聖經者辯論，他便力不從心了；沒有原文語言是做不到的」（同上，117）。

John Calvin similarly embodied the inseparability of scholarship and pastoral ministry. As David Steinmetz notes, "Calvin accepted without hesitation the humanist belief that the understanding of an ancient text depended in the first instance on the mastery of the language in which it was written. Calvin therefore preferred to read the Bible in its Greek and Hebrew originals, going so far as to take the Hebrew and Greek text into the pulpit with him" (Steinmetz, "John Calvin as an Interpreter of the Bible," in *Calvin and the Bible*, ed. McKim, 2006, 287–88). John Currid confirms that "Calvin's commentary work was securely anchored in his linguistic study in the original biblical languages of Hebrew and Greek. And that is the primary reason that his work was fresh and engaging" (Currid, *Calvin and the Biblical Languages*, 2006, 43).

約翰・加爾文同樣體現了學術與牧職之不可分割。如大衛・斯坦梅茨所言：「加爾文毫不遲疑地接受人文主義的信念，即理解一部古代文本首先取決於掌握其書寫語言。因此加爾文偏好閱讀聖經的希臘文與希伯來文原文，甚至將希伯來文和希臘文聖經帶入講壇」（Steinmetz,〈John Calvin as an Interpreter of the Bible〉, in *Calvin and the Bible*, ed. McKim, 2006, 287–88）。約翰・柯里德確認：「加爾文的註釋工作穩固地根植於他對聖經原文希伯來文與希臘文的語言學研究。這正是他的著作保持新鮮感與吸引力的首要原因」（Currid, *Calvin and the Biblical Languages*, 2006, 43）。

This tradition extends far beyond the sixteenth century. The **Westminster Confession of Faith** (1646), I.8, declares that because the Old Testament was "immediately inspired by God" in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, "in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them." Francis Turretin (1623–1687) insisted that "the Hebrew of the Old and the Greek of the New Testament have always been and still are the only authentic versions by which all controversies of faith and religion… ought to be approved and tested" (Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 1, 112–13). The

Reformed tradition's commitment to the original languages was not optional; it was constitutive of what it meant to be Protestant.

此傳統遠不止於十六世紀。西敏信條（1646）第一章第八節宣告：因舊約「直接由上帝默示」以希伯來文，新約以希臘文，「在一切信仰爭議中，教會最終應訴諸原文」。弗朗西斯・屠瑞田（1623–1687）堅持：「舊約的希伯來文與新約的希臘文，一直是、現在仍是唯一的真實版本，一切信仰與宗教爭議……都應以此為準繩和試金石」（Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 1, 112–13）。改革宗傳統對原文語言的委身不是可選的；它是作為新教徒之含義的構成要素。

In contemporary Western seminaries, this commitment remains institutionally embedded. Reformed seminaries such as Westminster Theological Seminary, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, and the Protestant Reformed Theological Seminary (PRTS) require multiple semesters of both Hebrew and Greek. As the PRTS curriculum states: "Because preaching depends on faithful exposition of Scripture and faithful exposition depends on the ability to work with the original languages of Scripture, it is imperative that students graduating from PRTS possess the ability to work with the original languages of Scripture" (RFPA, "A Plea on Behalf of the Biblical Languages," *The Standard Bearer*).

在當代西方神學院中，此委身仍然在制度上根深蒂固。改革宗神學院如威敏斯特神學院、戈登-康威爾神學院及新教改革宗神學院（PRTS）均要求多個學期的希伯來文與希臘文課程。如PRTS課程所述：「因為講道取決於忠實地闡釋聖經，而忠實的闡釋取決於能夠使用聖經原文的能力，從PRTS畢業的學生必須具備使用聖經原文語言的能力」（RFPA,〈A Plea on Behalf of the Biblical Languages〉, *The Standard Bearer*）。

II. The Chinese Protestant Context: Hostility Toward Original-Language Scholarship

二、華人新教處境：對原文語言學術的敵視

The Chinese Protestant landscape presents a starkly different picture. Rather than viewing the original languages as the authoritative foundation of all biblical interpretation, many Chinese believers and church leaders have effectively canonized the Chinese Union Version itself. As Kevin Xiyi Yao, Associate Professor of World Christianity at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, observes: "For most Chinese Protestants, the CUV unquestionably remains an authority with the status of 'God's Word.' While there are multiple Chinese versions of the Scriptures, occasionally Chinese Christians declare on the internet that only the CUV is the true Bible, and all other versions are erroneous and even heretical" (Yao, "A Century Later, the Chinese Union Version Still Dominant," *Christianity Today*, 2022).

華人新教的圖景呈現出截然不同的面貌。許多華人信徒與教會領袖不是將原文語言視為一切聖經詮釋的權威基礎，而是實際上將和合本本身加以「正典化」。正如戈登-康威爾神學院世界基督教副教授姚西伊所觀察：「對大多數華人新教徒而言，和合本無疑仍是具有『上帝之道』地位的權威。雖然有多種中文聖經版本，但偶爾華人基督徒會在網路上宣稱只有和合本才是真正的聖經，其他版本都是錯誤的，甚至是異端的」（Yao,〈A Century Later, the Chinese Union Version Still Dominant〉, *Christianity Today*, 2022）。

This elevation of a *translation* to the level of the original texts creates a theological environment inherently hostile to anyone who appeals to the Greek or Hebrew to correct misunderstandings arising from the Chinese rendering. When a scholar points out that the CUV's translation of a particular term does not fully capture the semantic range of the underlying Greek or Hebrew word, such correction is received not as helpful clarification but as an attack on "God's Word" itself.

將一個譯本抬舉至原文的層級，創造了一個本質上敵視任何引用希臘文或希伯來文來糾正因中文翻譯所產生之誤解的神學環境。當一位學者指出和合本對某個特定詞彙的翻譯未能

完全捕捉其背後希臘文或希伯來文的語意範圍時，這樣的糾正不被視為有益的澄清，而是被當作對「上帝之道」本身的攻擊。

Scholar Chin Ken-pa has noted that the CUV "could well be the most influential 'Chinese text' among the Chinese readers for the past one hundred years and also in the future… even if we cannot claim it has become a 'canon' in the Chinese world, it is certainly an 'authority'" (Chin Ken-pa, in *Ever Since God Spoke Chinese* [《自從上帝說中文》], 校園書房). This quasi-canonical status means that the CUV's theological vocabulary—its particular renderings of terms like *faith* (信), *sin* (罪), *salvation* (救恩), and *grace* (恩典)—has become the only theological language system known and used by the Chinese Protestant community. As Yao writes: "The CUV's translation of key biblical terms has been deeply ingrained in the theological DNA of the Chinese Protestant community around the world… one can hardly identify any single, vernacular translation of the Bible which has had such a commanding and lasting impact on church life in the West" (*Christianity Today*, 2022).

學者金根柏指出，和合本「很可能是過去一百年以來、也將是未來在華人讀者中最具影響力的『中文文本』……即使我們不能說它已成為華人世界的『正典』，它確實是一個『權威』」（金根柏，《自從上帝說中文》，校園書房）。這種準正典地位意味著和合本的神學用語——其對「信」（faith）、「罪」（sin）、「救恩」（salvation）、「恩典」（grace）等詞彙的特定翻譯——已成為華人新教圈唯一已知並使用的神學語言體系。如姚西伊所寫：「和合本對聖經關鍵詞彙的翻譯已深植於全球華人新教群體的神學DNA中……人們很難在西方找到任何一個白話譯本對教會生活產生如此強大且持久的影響」（*Christianity Today*, 2022）。

The practical consequence is that any scholar who refers to the original languages is perceived as undermining the authority that Chinese believers have invested in their single translation. This creates what can only be described as a hostile environment for genuine biblical scholarship within Chinese Protestant circles.

實際後果是：任何引用原文語言的學者，都被視為在顛覆華人信徒投注於其唯一譯本之權威。這所創造的，只能描述為一個對真正聖經學術充滿敵意的環境。

III. Anti-Intellectualism as the "Original Sin" of the Chinese Church

三、反智主義作為華人教會的「原罪」

The hostility toward theological scholarship in Chinese Protestantism is not merely a matter of translation loyalty; it is a symptom of a far deeper structural problem that Yonghua Ge has termed the "original sin" of the Chinese Church. In his landmark essay "The Scandal of the Chinese Evangelical Mind" (2024), published in *Religious Studies and Theology*, Ge argues: "Anti-intellectualism is so persuasive and deep-rooted in the Chinese Church that many Christians perceive faith and knowledge as unrelated or opposed to each other, to the extent that one's level of piety is often seen as inversely proportional to their level of education" (Ge, "The Scandal of the Chinese Evangelical Mind," *Religious Studies and Theology*, 2024, DOI: 10.1558/rst.34569).

華人新教中對神學學術的敵視，不僅僅是翻譯忠誠度的問題；它是一個遠為深層的結構性問題的症狀——葛牧之將之稱為華人教會的「原罪」。在其標誌性論文〈華人福音派心智的醜聞〉（2024）中，發表於*Religious Studies and Theology*期刊，葛牧之論述道：「反智主義在華人教會中極具說服力且根深蒂固，以致許多基督徒視信仰與知識為無關甚或對立，甚至一個人的敬虔程度常被認為與其教育程度成反比」（Ge,〈The Scandal of the Chinese Evangelical Mind〉, *Religious Studies and Theology*, 2024, DOI: 10.1558/rst.34569）。

In a 2025 interview with the OC *Behold* (《舉目》) editorial department, Ge provided a precise definition: "I define 'anti-intellectualism' in the Chinese Church as: the tendency or behavior among Christians to oppose reflecting on, or exploring, faith and related issues through reason and dialogue. It includes two dimensions: first, the rejection of

rational reflection on faith; second, opposition to discussion or dialogue with others on matters of faith" (Ge, interview, *Behold*, August 2025).

在2025年接受《舉目》編輯部訪談時，葛牧之提供了精確定義：「我將中國教會的『反智主義』定義為：基督徒反對以理性和對話的方式反思，或探討信仰及相關問題的傾向或行為。它包括兩個層面：第一，對信仰作理性反思的拒絕；第二，對就信仰問題與他人對話或討論的反對」（葛牧之，受訪於《舉目》，2025年8月）。

Ge identifies three core characteristics of this anti-intellectualism that directly bear upon the hostility toward scholars of the biblical languages:

葛牧之指出此反智主義的三個核心特徵，直接關涉對聖經語言學者的敵視：

First, an anti-theological stance (反神學的立場). Anti-intellectualists within the Chinese Church emphasize that "one only needs to read the Bible, pray, and be led by the Holy Spirit," regarding theology as "human knowledge" and "worldly learning," or even a "contamination" of Scripture. They set faith against thought and depreciate the value of reason in the life of faith. Many pastors and preachers, in the name of "spirituality," reject systematic theology and critical thinking (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第一，反神學的立場。華人教會中的反智主義者往往強調「只要讀經、禱告、有聖靈引導就夠了」，認為神學是「人的知識」、「屬世的學問」，甚至是對聖經的「污染」。他們將信仰與思想對立，貶低理性在信仰生活中的價值。很多牧者或講道人以屬靈之名，排斥系統神學與批判思維（葛牧之，《舉目》訪談，2025）。

Second, closure and dogmatism (信仰封閉與獨斷). Because of the absence of reflection on faith, anti-intellectualists easily equate their own understanding of Scripture with Scripture itself, holding an absolutely negative attitude toward others' readings. They sacralize their own partial experiences, tolerating no questioning and unwilling to

make corrections. This suppresses normal discussion within the Church and provides soil for heterodoxy (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第二，信仰封閉與獨斷。由於缺乏對信仰的反思，反智主義者容易把自己對聖經的理解等同於聖經本身，對他人解讀持絕對否定態度。他們將個人片面的經驗神聖化，不容質疑，也不願修正。這壓制了教會內正常的討論空間，也為偏差與異端提供了土壤（葛牧之，《舉目》訪談，2025）。

Third, binary-oppositional thinking (二元對立的思維). Anti-intellectualists prefer to draw absolute boundaries between "right/wrong," "of God/of the world," "orthodox/heretical," permitting no grey areas. They regard the world as black-and-white, viewing themselves as guardians of truth while labeling all other perspectives as erroneous or worldly. This exclusivism ultimately causes internal division and weakens the gospel's external appeal (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第三，二元對立的思維。反智主義者喜歡在信仰上劃清「對/錯」「屬神/屬世」「正統/異端」的絕對界限，不容許灰度地帶的存在。他們將世界視為非黑即白，將自己視為真理的守衛者，其他觀點則被貼上錯誤、世俗的標籤。這種排他主義最終造成教會內部分裂，也削弱了福音對外的吸引力（葛牧之，《舉目》訪談，2025）。

IV. Historical Roots: Wang Mingdao, Watchman Nee, and the Legacy of Fundamentalist Anti-Intellectualism

四、歷史根源：王明道、倪柝聲，與基要主義反智之遺產

The anti-intellectual tradition that produces hostility toward biblical scholars has identifiable historical origins in three towering figures of twentieth-century Chinese Protestantism: **Watchman Nee (倪柝聲)**, **Wang Mingdao (王明道)**, and **John Sung (宋尚節)**. As Ge's 2024 article in the *Journal of Research for Christianity in China*

demonstrates, "just as Watchman Nee's trichotomous view of humanity has left a profound anti-intellectual impact on the Chinese Church, so is Wang Mingdao's fundamental theology an essential part of the Chinese church's anti-intellectual tradition" (Ge, "Anti-intellectualism in Wang Mingdao's Fundamentalist Theology," *JRCC* 23, 2024, 158–184).

產生對聖經學者之敵意的反智傳統，可追溯至二十世紀華人新教三位巨擘：倪柝聲、王明道、宋尚節。如葛牧之2024年在《中國基督教研究》的論文所示：「正如倪柝聲的三元人觀對華人教會留下了深刻的反智影響，王明道的基要神學同樣是華人教會反智傳統的重要組成部分」（Ge,〈Anti-intellectualism in Wang Mingdao's Fundamentalist Theology〉, *JRCC* 23, 2024, 158–184）。

Watchman Nee's trichotomy (倪柝聲的三元論**)** divided the human person into spirit (靈), soul (魂), and body (體), with the soul—encompassing reason, emotion, and will—assigned to the realm of "the natural man" (天然人) that must be "broken" (破碎) for spiritual progress. As Ge explains in his *Behold* interview: "In this worldview, the 'soul'—that is, the part including reason, emotion, and will—is regarded as fleshly, worldly, and an obstacle to the growth of spiritual life. Believers were thus taught to 'crucify' reason, suppress the body, and abandon the senses, retaining only the 'spirit' for communion with God." While some scholars have nuanced the anti-intellectualist reading of Nee (cf. Pan Zhao, "Is the Spiritual Man Pentecostal?" *Religions* 14:7, 2023; Brian Chiu, "The Sinicization of Christian Pietism," in *Modern Chinese Theologies*, vol. 2, ed. Chloë Starr, 2023, 155–56; Dongsheng John Wu, *Understanding Watchman Nee*, Wipf and Stock, 2012), the *popular reception* and *ecclesial deployment* of Nee's teaching within Chinese churches has demonstrably produced an anti-rational culture—regardless of what Nee himself may have intended.

倪柝聲的三元論將人分為靈、魂、體，其中魂——涵蓋理性、情感與意志——被歸入需要「破碎」以達靈命成長的「天然人」範疇。如葛牧之在《舉目》訪談中解釋：「在這種觀念中，人

的『魂』——即包括理性、情感、意志的部分——被視為屬肉體、屬世界，阻礙屬靈生命的成長。於是，信徒被教導要『釘死』理性、壓抑身體、棄絕感官，只留下『靈』去與神交流。」雖然一些學者對倪柝聲反智主義的解讀提出了更細緻的看法（參 Pan Zhao,〈Is the Spiritual Man Pentecostal?〉, *Religions* 14:7, 2023; Brian Chiu,〈The Sinicization of Christian Pietism〉, in *Modern Chinese Theologies*, vol. 2, ed. Chloë Starr, 2023, 155–56; Dongsheng John Wu, *Understanding Watchman Nee*, Wipf and Stock, 2012），倪柝聲教導在華人教會中的大眾接受與教會運用，確實可證地產生了一種反理性文化——無論倪氏本人原意為何。

Wang Mingdao's fundamentalism (王明道的基要主義**)** compounded this problem. Wang's theology arose in the context of resistance to liberal theology imported by Western missionaries. While this resistance was understandable, it metastasized into a wholesale rejection of all theological reflection as inherently "modernist" or "liberal." Wang's stance "made anti-intellectualism an integral part of the Chinese church's faith tradition" as part of the fundamentalist reaction against liberalism (Ge, *JRCC* 23, 2024). The consequence was that any form of sustained intellectual engagement with Scripture—including learning the original languages—was coded as spiritually suspect.

王明道的基要主義加劇了此問題。王明道的神學產生於抵擋西方宣教士引入之自由主義神學的脈絡中。這種抵抗雖可理解，卻發展為對一切神學反思的全盤拒絕，將之等同於「現代主義」或「自由派」。王明道的立場「使反智主義成為華人教會信仰傳統不可分割的一部分」，作為基要主義對自由主義反應的一環（Ge, *JRCC* 23, 2024）。後果是，任何對聖經的持續性理智參與——包括學習原文語言——都被編碼為靈性上可疑的。

V. The Contrast: Western Zeal versus Chinese Suspicion

五、對比：西方的熱切與華人的猜疑

The contrast between Western and Chinese Protestant attitudes toward original-language scholarship could hardly be more stark. Consider the following dimensions:

西方與華人新教對原文語言學術之態度的對比，幾乎不能更鮮明。試考量以下幾個面向：

Institutional commitment (制度性委身). In the Western Protestant world, seminary education requiring Greek and Hebrew has been the norm since the Reformation. Luther established Hebrew and Greek chairs at the University of Wittenberg; Calvin secured skilled linguists for the Academy of Geneva; the Synod of Dordrecht (1578) mandated Bible translation from the Hebrew; and contemporary Reformed seminaries maintain rigorous language requirements. In the Chinese context, as *Global Ministries* reports, "the shortage of pastors and lay leaders with theological and biblical training is a serious problem for the church in China" (Global Ministries, "Theological Education in China"). The P2P Networks ministry reports that "90% of [Chinese pastoral] students have no formal pastor training" (P2P Networks, "The Need"). Formal instruction in the biblical languages remains vanishingly rare in Chinese seminary contexts.

制度性委身。在西方新教世界中，要求希臘文和希伯來文的神學院教育自宗教改革以來即為常態。路德在威登堡大學設立了希伯來文與希臘文教席；加爾文為日內瓦學院延攬語言學能手；多特大會（1578）要求從希伯來文翻譯聖經；當代改革宗神學院維持嚴格的語言要求。在華人處境中，如全球事工（Global Ministries）報告所指：「在中國教會中，具有神學和聖經訓練的牧師和平信徒領袖之短缺，是一個嚴重的問題。」P2P Networks事工報告「90%的（華人牧職）學生沒有正式的牧師培訓。」在華人神學院體系中，聖經原文語言的正式教學仍極為罕見。

Cultural attitude toward the scholar (對學者的文化態度). In Western Protestantism, the pastor-scholar is an ideal. From Luther and Calvin through Jonathan Edwards, Charles Hodge, B.B. Warfield, and contemporary figures, the Western tradition

celebrates the minister who is both learned and devout. In Chinese Protestantism, the implicit equation is often reversed: spiritual depth is associated with simplicity, and learning is associated with pride or worldliness. Ge observes that many Chinese Christians "naturally regard faith as only concerning matters of the heart, having nothing to do with reason or thought. Some even believe that only unbelievers use reason to reflect on faith, while truly faithful people simply accept by pure faith" (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

對學者的文化態度。在西方新教中，牧者-學者是一個理想典範。從路德和加爾文經約拿單·愛德華茲、查爾斯·霍智、華菲德，到當代人物，西方傳統表彰既博學又敬虔的牧者。在華人新教中，隱含的等式往往被逆轉：靈命深度與簡樸聯繫，學識則與驕傲或世俗掛鉤。葛牧之觀察到，許多華人基督徒「理所當然地認為信仰只關乎心靈的事，與理性或思想無關。甚至有人認為，只有不信的人才用理性反思信仰，而真正相信的人憑著單純的信心接受就可以了」（葛牧之，《舉目》訪談，2025）。

Response to correction from the original languages (對來自原文之糾正的回應). When a Western Reformed pastor encounters a scholar who corrects a point of translation from the Greek or Hebrew, the typical institutional response is gratitude and further inquiry; the original languages are acknowledged as the final court of appeal. When a Chinese believer or pastor encounters such correction, the response is often defensive or hostile: the correction is perceived as an attack on the CUV and, by extension, on "the Bible itself." This is because, as Yao notes, the CUV has become fused with Chinese Protestant identity—it "is very close to their hearts" and is part of "the Chinese church's collective memory and heritage" (Yao, *Christianity Today*, 2022). To question the CUV is to question one's entire spiritual formation.

對來自原文之糾正的回應。當一位西方改革宗牧者遇到學者從希臘文或希伯來文糾正翻譯要點時，典型的制度性回應是感恩和進一步探究；原文語言被承認為最終的上訴法庭。當一位華人信徒或牧者遇到這樣的糾正時，回應往往是防衛性的或帶有敵意的：這種糾正被感

知為對和合本的攻擊，進而被視為對「聖經本身」的攻擊。這是因為，如姚西伊所言，和合本已與華人新教身份融為一體——它「非常貼近他們的心」，是「華人教會集體記憶與傳承」的一部分（Yao, *Christianity Today*, 2022）。質疑和合本就是質疑一個人全部的屬靈塑造。

VI. The Fusion of Confucian Pragmatism and Western Fundamentalism

六、儒家實用主義與西方基要主義的融合

Ge makes a crucial observation that the "Chinese-style anti-intellectualism" (中國式反智) is not merely a copy of Western fundamentalism but a unique hybrid produced by the fusion of Western fundamentalist influences with indigenous Confucian pragmatism. As he explains:

葛牧之做出了一個關鍵性的觀察：「中國式反智」不僅僅是對西方基要主義的複製，而是西方基要主義影響與本土儒家實用主義融合所產生的獨特混合體。如他所解釋：

"The Confucian tradition itself emphasizes pragmatism and has little interest in abstract metaphysical speculation. Chinese people tend to pursue 'useful truths'—if something can help me become holy and grow in spiritual life, it is good; while God's attributes, theological systems, and philosophical reflection, if unable to directly benefit spiritual life, are regarded as irrelevant. This 'pragmatism as the core of faith' mentality has long marginalized theological thinking, ultimately resulting in the absence of 'theology proper' [上帝論]" (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

「儒家傳統本就強調實用主義，對抽象的形而上思辨興趣不大。中國人往往追求『有用的真理』——能讓我成聖、靈命成長，就是好的；而上帝的屬性、神學體系、哲學反思等，若無法直接造就靈命，便被視為無關緊要。這種『以實用為信仰核心』的思維，使神學思考長期被邊緣化，最終導致『上帝論』的缺席」（葛牧之，《舉目》訪談，2025）。

This dual heritage explains why Chinese anti-intellectualism has a distinctive flavor compared to its Western counterpart. In the West, as Richard Hofstadter demonstrated in *Anti-intellectualism in American Life* (1963), the phenomenon arose largely from democratic populism and revivalist movements that exalted "common sense" over learned expertise. In China, the same functional outcome—distrust of the learned—arises from different roots: the pragmatic Confucian suspicion of "useless" abstract knowledge, combined with the fundamentalist suspicion of "worldly" rationality imported through early twentieth-century missionary contacts.

這種雙重遺產解釋了為何華人反智主義與其西方對應物相比具有獨特的風味。在西方，如理查德·霍夫斯達特在《美國人生活中的反智主義》（1963）中所示，此現象主要源於民主民粹主義和復興運動，將「常識」抬舉於博學之上。在中國，相同的功能性結果——對博學者的不信任——產生於不同的根源：儒家對「無用」抽象知識的實用主義懷疑，加上通過二十世紀初宣教接觸所引入的基要主義對「屬世」理性的猜忌。

VII. The Irony: Watchman Nee's Own Method

七、諷刺之處：倪柝聲本人的方法

There is a profound irony in the fact that Chinese churches that claim the legacy of Watchman Nee are often the most hostile toward biblical-language scholarship, when Nee himself explicitly advocated for engagement with the original languages. In his talks from August 1949 and February 1950, Nee outlined a method of Bible study whose first principle was: "In studying the Word we have to pay attention to the original text" (Nee, *CWWN* 62, 295). Nee insisted that one must "translate it from scratch" from the original language and warned: "If we are not careful and serious in our study of the Word, we can easily build a message upon a wrong translation of a word" (*CWWN* 61, 43). He

further cautioned: "The worst thing is for a person to have only one version and to treat it as a foolproof text" (*CWWN* 62, 297).

有一個深刻的諷刺：聲稱承繼倪柝聲遺產的華人教會，往往是最敵視聖經語言學術的，而倪柝聲本人明確倡導與原文語言的接觸。在其1949年8月與1950年2月的講論中，倪氏勾勒了一套讀經方法，其首要原則即是：「在研讀聖經時，我們必須留意原文」（倪柝聲，《倪柝聲文集》62冊，295）。倪氏堅持必須「從原文重新翻譯」，並警告：「若我們在研讀聖經時不夠仔細和嚴肅，很容易根據一個錯誤的翻譯來建構信息」（《文集》61冊，43）。他更告誡：「最糟糕的事，莫過於一個人只有一個版本，並把它當作萬無一失的文本」（《文集》62冊，297）。

Nee's own theological library numbered three thousand volumes by his early twenties, containing "nearly all the classical Christian writings from the first century on" (Witness Lee, *Watchman Nee: A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, 25). He relied on technical exegetes such as Henry Alford and Christopher Wordsworth and insisted that rejecting the insights of prior scholarship was "a sure sign of the sickly pride of Laodicea" (*CWWN* 47, 84–85).

倪柝聲在二十歲出頭時，其個人神學藏書已達三千冊，包含「從第一世紀以來幾乎所有的古典基督教著作」（李常受，《倪柝聲——神聖啟示的先見》，25）。他依賴如亨利·奧爾福德和克里斯多福·華茲沃斯等技術性釋經家，並堅持認為拒絕前人學術洞見是「老底嘉式病態驕傲的確切標記」（《文集》47冊，84–85）。

The Chinese churches that invoke Nee's name to justify their anti-scholarly posture are thus committing a historical error—they are perpetuating a caricature of Nee's teaching rather than faithfully following his actual method. As the recent scholarly reassessment by Brian Chiu concludes: "labels such as anti-intellectualism, spiritualism, subjectivism, and body-soul dualism… should be reexamined and removed" from characterizations of Nee's theology (Chiu, in *Modern Chinese Theologies*, vol. 2, ed. Starr, 2023, 155–56). The anti-intellectualism lives not in Nee's texts but in the *selective and partial reading* of

those texts by subsequent generations—what Pan Zhao identifies as scholars "only focus[ing] on the first half of *Spiritual Man*, while overlooking the theological insights presented in the second half, which emphasizes the role of mind and will" (Pan Zhao, *Religions* 14:7, 2023, 833).

以倪氏之名來合理化其反學術姿態的華人教會，因此犯了歷史性的錯誤——他們延續的是倪柝聲教導的漫畫式描繪，而非忠實地遵循其實際方法。如Brian Chiu近年的學術重新評估所結論：「反智主義、唯靈主義、主觀主義和身心二元論等標籤……應當被重新審視並從對倪氏神學的刻畫中移除」（Chiu, in *Modern Chinese Theologies*, vol. 2, ed. Starr, 2023, 155–56）。反智主義並不存在於倪氏的文本中，而是存在於後世對這些文本的選擇性和片面性閱讀中——如Pan Zhao所指出，一些學者「只關注《屬靈人》的前半部分，而忽略了後半部分所呈現的、強調心智和意志角色的神學洞見」（Pan Zhao, *Religions* 14:7, 2023, 833）。

VIII. Consequences of the Hostility Toward Theological Scholarship

八、敵視神學學術的後果

Ge identifies five major harms resulting from the anti-intellectual culture that breeds hostility toward scholars:

葛牧之指出反智文化所滋生之敵視學者現象的五大危害：

First, the proliferation of heresy and doctrinal deviation (滋生異端與偏差). Without rational critical capacity, believers easily follow charismatic leaders blindly, lack discernment regarding doctrine, and allow erroneous teachings to spread unchecked (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第一，異端與教義偏差的蔓延。缺乏理性批判能力，信徒容易盲從具有魅力的領袖，缺乏對教義的辨識力，使錯謬教導不受約束地散播。

Second, the absence of a theological system (缺乏神學體系). Many churches have no complete framework of faith, judging everything solely by spiritual experience and the Holy Spirit's leading, leaving faith without firm foundations (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第二，神學體系的缺席。許多教會沒有完整的信仰架構，僅憑屬靈經驗和聖靈感動來判斷一切，信仰缺乏穩固根基。

Third, limitation of church development (限制教會發展). Without the support of theological thought, the church cannot face complex contemporary issues or enter the public sphere with influence (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第三，限制教會發展。沒有神學思想的支撐，教會難以面對複雜的時代議題，也難以進入公共領域發揮影響力。

Fourth, distortion of spiritual life (扭曲屬靈生命). Jesus exhibited not only love and faith but also the highest wisdom. Anti-intellectualism causes believers to pursue only "spiritual feelings" while neglecting the renewal of the mind and conformity to the whole person of Christ (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第四，扭曲屬靈生命。耶穌不僅充滿愛與信心，也具有極高的智慧。反智主義使信徒只追求「屬靈感動」，卻忽略了心意更新和效法基督全人的重要性。

Fifth, weakening of the gospel witness (削弱福音見證). When facing contemporary intellectuals, anti-intellectual Christians often lose all persuasive power, causing educated people to mistakenly conclude that Christian faith is inherently irrational and anti-scientific (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第五，削弱福音見證。在面對當代知識階層時，反智的基督徒往往喪失說服力，甚至讓知識群體誤以為基督信仰就是非理性、反科學的。

IX. A Comparative Summary

九、比較總結

The following comparison crystallizes the divergence:

以下比較將這一分歧具體化：

In **Western Protestantism**, the Reformation principle that Scripture must be studied in its original languages is structurally embedded in confession (Westminster Confession I.8), education (mandatory seminary Greek and Hebrew), hermeneutics (grammatical-historical exegesis), and homiletics (preaching grounded in original-text exposition). The scholar who knows Greek and Hebrew is honored as a servant of the Church. The corrective voice that says, "The original language actually says..." is welcomed as a gift.

在西方新教中，聖經必須以其原文語言研讀的宗教改革原則，結構性地嵌入信條（西敏信條 I.8）、教育（神學院必修的希臘文與希伯來文）、詮釋學（文法-歷史解經）和講道學（以原文闡釋為基礎的講道）。懂得希臘文和希伯來文的學者被尊為教會的僕人。說「原文實際上是說……」的糾正之聲被歡迎為一份禮物。

In **Chinese Protestantism**, a vernacular translation has been elevated to quasi-canonical status; the original languages are functionally unknown and institutionally neglected; the scholar who refers to Greek or Hebrew is viewed with suspicion or hostility; and correction from the original text is perceived as an attack on the faith community's identity and spiritual heritage.

在華人新教中，一個白話譯本被抬舉至準正典的地位；原文語言在功能上不為人知、在制度上被忽略；引用希臘文或希伯來文的學者遭到猜忌或敵視；來自原文的糾正被感知為對信仰群體之身份和屬靈傳承的攻擊。

X. Toward a Way Forward

十、走向出路

The path forward for Chinese Protestantism is not to abandon the CUV or to denigrate its historical importance—the CUV is indeed, as Yao writes, "a precious gift to the Chinese church from God" (*Christianity Today*, 2022). Rather, the path forward is to recover what the Reformation always insisted upon: that all translations must be judged by and accountable to the original languages. As Luther warned: "If through our neglect we let the languages go (which God forbid!), we shall… lose the Gospel."

華人新教的出路，不是拋棄和合本或貶低其歷史重要性——和合本確實如姚西伊所寫，是「上帝賜給華人教會的珍貴禮物」（*Christianity Today*, 2022）。出路毋寧是恢復宗教改革一貫堅持的原則：一切譯本必須接受原文語言的判斷並向其問責。正如路德所警告的：「若因我們的疏忽而任由語言流失（願上帝禁止！），我們將……失去福音。」

This requires, first, an honest acknowledgment that the CUV, like all translations, is a human work that sometimes fails to fully convey the meaning of the original. As C.C. Liu's doctoral research demonstrates, "the theology of the Protestant missionaries who translated the CUV has influenced Chinese Christianity through the translation itself" (Liu, *The Influence of the Theology of Protestant Missionaries in China on Chinese Christianity through the Translation of the Chinese Union Version of the Bible*, Durham University, 2023). The theological decisions embedded in any translation inevitably shape the theology of those who read only that translation—and such shaping may not always be faithful to the original.

這首先需要誠實地承認，和合本如同一切翻譯一樣，是人的工作，有時未能完全傳達原文的含義。如劉偲偲的博士研究所示：「翻譯和合本的新教宣教士之神學，已透過翻譯本身影響了華人基督教」（Liu, *The Influence of the Theology of Protestant Missionaries in China on Chinese Christianity through the Translation of the Chinese Union Version of the Bible*, Durham University, 2023）。嵌入任何翻譯中的神學決定，不可避免地塑造了那些僅閱讀該翻譯之人的神學——而這種塑造不一定總是忠於原文的。

Second, Chinese theological education must prioritize instruction in biblical Greek and Hebrew. Until Chinese seminaries and training programs equip pastors and teachers with competence in the original languages, the Church will remain dependent upon—and intellectually captive to—a single translation.

第二，華人神學教育必須優先進行聖經希臘文和希伯來文的教學。在華人神學院和培訓計劃裝備牧師與教師具備原文語言能力之前，教會將持續依賴——並在智識上受制於——一個單一的翻譯。

Third, the Church must learn to honor and welcome the corrective voice of scholars who possess knowledge of the original languages, receiving their insights not as threats but as gifts for the building up of the Body of Christ (Ephesians 4:11–12). As Ge concludes: "A healthy church must start from its understanding of God. If we have deficiencies in our doctrine of God [上帝論], all other theological constructions will deviate accordingly" (Ge, *Behold* interview, 2025).

第三，教會必須學會尊榮並歡迎那些擁有原文語言知識的學者之糾正之聲，接受他們的洞見不是作為威脅，而是作為建立基督身體的恩賜（以弗所書4:11-12）。如葛牧之總結：「一個健康的教會必須從對上帝的理解出發。如果我們在上帝論上就有缺陷，其他神學建構也會隨之偏離」（葛牧之，《舉目》訪談，2025）。

Conclusion 結論

The hostility toward theologians and scholars within Chinese Protestant circles is not a minor cultural quirk; it is a structural crisis with theological, historical, and cultural roots that, if left unaddressed, will continue to impoverish the Chinese Church, render it vulnerable to heresy, and weaken its gospel witness to the world. The comparison with Western Protestantism reveals not that the West is perfect—Mark Noll's *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (1994) demonstrates that anti-intellectualism afflicts the West as well—but that the Western tradition at least possesses institutional safeguards, confessional commitments, and educational structures that honor the original languages as the final authority in all matters of biblical interpretation.

華人新教圈內對神學家與學者的敵視，不是一個微不足道的文化怪癖；它是一場具有神學、歷史與文化根源的結構性危機，若不加以正視，將繼續使華人教會貧乏，使之易受異端攻擊，並削弱其對世界的福音見證。與西方新教的比較所揭示的，並非西方是完美的——馬克·諾爾的《福音派心智的醜聞》（1994）表明反智主義同樣困擾著西方——而是西方傳統至少擁有制度性的保障、信條性的委身，以及教育結構，尊榮原文語言作為一切聖經詮釋事宜的最終權威。

The Chinese Church must build analogous structures if it is to fulfill its calling. The first step is to stop treating those who know the original languages as enemies, and to begin treating them as what they are: servants of the Word, following in the footsteps of Luther, Calvin, and indeed of the Apostles themselves, who first delivered the faith once for all in the languages of Hebrew and Greek.

華人教會若要完成其使命，必須建立類似的結構。第一步是停止將那些懂得原文語言的人視為仇敵，開始將他們視為其所是的：聖道的僕人，追隨路德、加爾文，以及使徒們自己的腳蹤——他們最初用希伯來文和希臘文將那一次交付的信仰傳遞了下來。

Works Cited 引用文獻

Chiu, Brian Siu Kit. "The Sinicization of Christian Pietism: Jia Yuming's and Watchman Nee's Approaches to the Problem of Rationality versus Spirituality." In *Modern Chinese Theologies: Volume 2: Independent and Indigenous*, edited by Chloë Starr, 141–160. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2023.

Currid, John D. *Calvin and the Biblical Languages*. Geanies House: Christian Focus Publications, 2006.

Ge, Yonghua (葛牧之). "Anti-intellectualism in Wang Mingdao's Fundamentalist Theology." *Journal of Research for Christianity in China* 23 (2024): 158–184.

———. "The Scandal of the Chinese Evangelical Mind." *Religious Studies and Theology* (2024). DOI: 10.1558/rst.34569.

———. *Zhongguo Jiaohui de Fanzhi Zhuyi* (中國教會的反智主義 / Anti-Intellectualism in the Chinese Church). Taipei: Taiwan Christian Literature Council (校園書房出版社), 2025.

———. Interview with *Behold* (《舉目》) editorial department. OC Ministries, August 22, 2025.

Global Ministries. "Theological Education in China." https://www.globalministries.org/project/theological_education_in_china/.

Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Lapide, Pinchas E. *Hebrew in the Church*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984.

Liu, C. C. *The Influence of the Theology of Protestant Missionaries in China on Chinese Christianity through the Translation of the Chinese Union Version of the Bible*. PhD diss., Durham University, 2023.

Luther, Martin. "To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools." Translated by A. T. W. Steinhaeuser. In *Works of Martin Luther*, vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, repr. 1982.

Nee, Watchman (倪柝聲). *Collected Works of Watchman Nee* (CWWN), various volumes. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry.

Noll, Mark A. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

P2P Networks. "The Need." https://www.p2pnetworks.org/the-need/.

Pan Zhao. "Is the Spiritual Man Pentecostal? Watchman Nee's Perspective on the Charismatic Experiences." *Religions* 14, no. 7 (2023): 833.

Schaff, Philip. *Theological Propaedeutic: A General Introduction to the Study of Theology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894.

Steinmetz, David C. "John Calvin as an Interpreter of the Bible." In *Calvin and the Bible*, edited by Donald K. McKim, 282–291. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. Vol. 1. Translated by George Musgrave Giger. Edited by James T. Dennison Jr. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1992.

Westminster Confession of Faith. In *Confession of Faith and Subordinate Standards*. Edinburgh: Free Church of Scotland, 1973.

Wu, Dongsheng John. *Understanding Watchman Nee: Spirituality, Knowledge, and Formation*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012.

Yao, Kevin Xiyi. "A Century Later, the Chinese Union Version Still Dominant." *Christianity Today*, April 2022.